

M674 GROUP III
NEW YORK CITY
NOVEMBER 10, 1964 TUESDAY

MR. NYLAND: ...We do that for various reasons, but this group, as you know, also has people who belong to another group and for them it may be a little difficult to be, ~~as~~ you might call it, checked in. I would suggest that anyone who is not yet checked in on the new list, that is for the ^{2nd} ~~new~~ group, please take care that you are. I am interested in attendance. I am interested in the accuracy of the lists we keep, and you have to help the secretaries who are there and... So it should not give you any particular difficulty, everybody should pass by that table and announce himself or herself as being present, so that you can be checked off on the list. I have to do this because there have been a few things like that ~~that~~ afterwards I do not know if people have come or not and it is a little confusing to me. It is already difficult enough to know the different people, what they look, particularly when they have new people and I would like to-- to have ^a ~~the~~ chance to know who is coming and also perhaps to find out why. *Wesley take a chair from the corner + come & sit here.*

(pause - seating)

MR. NYLAND: Now we will continue.

It is obvious you must know why I am interested in different people, particularly for this kind of a group because I hope that it will lead to more interest in Gurdjieff, and after all that is the ^{whole} ~~a~~ purpose of having groups at all, that the more people could become interested, the more chance

there would be for those people who really become interested to start work on themselves in the directions~~/~~-- in accordance with the directions of Gurdjieff, and that they because of that might benefit from that kind of a method, instead of having just an enjoyment in their mind or a little good feeling about attending a meeting and hearing a little bit about some interesting subject. The purpose of ~~the~~ meeting and also this as a preliminary meeting, you might call it a beginner's meeting, is really to get people interested in doing something more than just appearing at a meeting, and that it is necessary for you to understand that and for me to understand who is where and why they do come and, if they don't come, why they don't come. Because maybe something fundamentally wrong with me; it's maybe that I don't present certain things in the right way and that perhaps I do not know how to reach certain people who also might have their own psychological problems or whatever condition they are. So it is a question of gradually becoming a little bit more coherent and also a little bit more understanding among all of us so that we know what are the purposes^{*} why we do certain things in a certain way. ^P Next week I will not be here because I will be out of town, but instead of myself sitting here we will have a little different arrangement and there will be a panel of three persons who have been in this Work-- this kind of activity for some time. They will be Bruce Arcieri, Paul Caponigro, and . I limit it to the three. There are others who are evenly-- evenly qualified, also some of the women could have been here, but it is just a matter of a beginning. I hope we'll have more of that kind of thing even if I am here because the accent of a meeting of this kind will be more and more resting on the responsibility of those

who have already been familiar with the ideas for quite some time. I would have liked ~~Wesley~~ to be there but I was not sure that he may or may not come; it is a little exceptional that he is here tonight. So you understand the choice has nothing to do with the value of the different people except that I hope that the three being dependent on a response in an audience also will receive it. As far as the next meeting is concerned and the meeting tomorrow I will talk about that later, at the proper time. Now, who has any particular questions that we can talk about tonight?

Yes, ~~Leslie~~. *darling, let's hear it.*

~~Leslie~~: Can Divine Love be defined, and if it can be defined, could you speak about it? I don't know if this ~~has~~ anything to do exactly with Work but I've seen it in several different religions and philosophies, this word Divine Love.

MR. NYLAND: Who is interested in Divine Love? And who has something to say about it? Does it exist? Have you ever seen it or experienced it? Is it limited? I mean-- in general. You are interested in it but the question is does it exist as something that you would like to experience? Do you hope for it? Can it really exist? Has it existed in history? Or when people have used the word have they used it loosely? What is understood by Divine Love? Who has any idea? Yes, David?

David: It would seem that Divine Love, to love, would have the same connection or rather disconnection that subjectivity has to objectivity, that Divine Love is like an objective love, and that the love which we most often speak of is a very subjective kind of love, or interested in other than objective, or selfish motives. At one point in ALL AND EVERYTHING

Gurdjieff speaks of-- I don't know which commandment of God it is-- maybe it's the 18th Law-- 13th or 18th-- "to love everything that breathes," and it would seem to me that this kind of love-- loving everything that breathes-- would perhaps have a *grain* of Divine Love in it...if that helps any.

MR. NYLAND: Does it help?

Leslie: No.

MR. NYLAND: Not yet.

Leslie: No.

MR. NYLAND: Well, let's define Love first, and ^{then} see what is Divine. Who can define love? What is love? Between two people? In a family? Friends? Animals? Plants? How would you define it? What is this feeling? ...yes?

lynn Burnett: Well, I think it's an emotion. It's not intellectual. I think it's emotional. ^{It's} ~~Not~~ subjective.

MR. NYLAND: That I think we agree on-- more or less.

Yes?

_____: Isn't Divine Love a flowing force that emanates from something higher, and perhaps something higher in us towards...that which everything came from?

MR. NYLAND: Let's try to define what is Love ^{first} ~~first~~. How do you understand it? Who has any ideas? All of us know it, of course. What we call love every once in a while, (it) may go by different names too, but we ought to know something about it.

Juanita: To me personally, I can ^{be} nearest to the understanding of it, feeling strongly and very honest admiration for another person. (

).

MR. NYLAND: ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Well, we agree that the feeling, at least mostly...?

Juanita: (?)

MR. NYLAND: Is is based on certain knowledge?

Juanita: If I esteem somebody very highly, there is the result that-- I should say-- a feeling-- to appreciate--

MR. NYLAND: I think it's more than that. Lisette, are you here?

Lisette: Yes.

MR. NYLAND: Do you remember, man and woman? The long rigamarole we had about that? Huh? Didn't we talk then about Love? Do you remember? Did anything still get stuck of that? Come, ^{children,} tell, what is love? It is such a simple thing. Fanny?

Fanny: Well, I would think of it as a special interest, a caring for an individual, and a lessening of one's own interests in the interests of someone else, and a particular desire to help or to share-- care, affection, interests for an individual.

MR. NYLAND: Yes, of course it has to do with wishing something for someone else or something else, but it also could be a love for something which one could admire and which may not be reachable. Bruce, what do you think?

Bruce: I think-- I think of love as an activity. I believe it has many-- ^{not is in the sense} and sense of caring, ^{and} an emotion that one has, but I believe it is an activity. Even as an emotion, it's not an ^{inward} ~~inward~~ kind of thing.

^{David} ~~Fanny~~ said something that struck me as just a little bit off, and I--
Tajia?

-6-

he said something about subjective and objective ^{them} (dividing). I think that ordinary love, or so-called-- what ^{he} you have tried to say was subjective love-- I think that can also be quite objective. I don't know if it then becomes divine, but I think that a person can love another person, or an animal, or a plant, to such an extent that they really ^{do} love a great many things, in order that whatever-- it will make that thing thrive (^{is} gets) accomplished, and in that way it really is objective toward the object ^{that's} or the beloved. But yet I don't know if that still yet becomes divine because I think it's not yet all-inclusive enough.

MR. NYLAND: When will it become Divine?

Bruce: Something about Divine, when we use the word in another way; in a verb way, we say, "Can you divine me the answer?" is an expression that we use. It has something to do with a pureness, an absoluteness, a kind of oneness. I don't know a better way to put it.

MR. NYLAND: Let's make a distinction between the feeling of love and the expression of it.

Bruce: Yes. I think that has to do with it.

MR. NYLAND: ^{So} Let's consider the state of a person in love. It is quite definitely in a state in which he ^{is, he} has the experience ^{of} something-- we call it a feeling, and the finer (that) the feeling is the more it could become emotional, and probably it could reach a certain state of divinity, that is, such purity that you compare it with anything or something that has to do with the Deity, because Divine Love must come from that, so sometimes Divine has to do with something that's a little bit less Earthly, but if we consider the state in which a person is, and he says, "I love," I love what, or who? How? How do I love? With what? What

is it that takes place in a person when he is in a state of loving some-
^{one} thing or someone ^{thing} else, or, love of mankind? Love of the world? Love
 of his work? Loves to do certain things. What does it produce then?
 An emotional vibration of something that really lifts him to some extent?
 Or ^{it} makes him during that particular period when he experiences, it makes
 him a different kind of a person. What is it that really starts to appear,
 and that then forces one to express it in a certain way? Are there
 different gradations of love? With different people, of course, one
 loves differently, and one loves a different person maybe in quite a
 different way from someone else, and it may be that the other person ^{produces a different feeling in me} may ^{also that one person may}
 not be capable of a certain form of love which someone else tries to ^{show}
 show. Is it necessary to express love in words? What do we use for the
 expression of it? ^{And} What particular level is involved?

These are the questions that first have to come up when I say
 "I have an experience of being involved in something that, you might
 say, takes me up, and that I feel a certain something for someone
 and I call it love, because I wish that person to have everything that
 that particular person needs." How much of that particular kind of a love
 that one wants to have for someone else reflects again on ^{one} myself, so that
 I say "I love you that I feel better because I love you." Or rather that
 when I say I love someone else that the other person feels better because
 that person is being loved by me. And what particular level is that
 what I consider a feeling for myself? What is the satisfaction that I
 want out of that feeling if I say "this is a state which has to be
 expressed in a certain way." How do I express it? What is called
 Platonic love? Love without sex? Is sex deleterious to love? Does it

hurt it? Is it a form of love? Is it based on something that really has to do with a feeling for someone or is it based on a chemical attraction? Is it possible to have an emotional love only? Not only intellectual, but emotional, really, a love that takes one up completely, without wanting anything else, without wanting any particular sexual expression. You realize there are three different forms, depending entirely on which particular part of a person happens to be in the foreground, or whatever way a particular person is developed. Because sometimes he may be just emotional and the other two so-called centers of himself may not be as expressed or may not have that same kind of a value. Sometimes one says, "No, all I wish is a satisfaction as far as my body is concerned, and I call it love because it is a feeling that I wish to have in order to satisfy myself, or in the process to satisfy someone else, and perhaps in sharing that, that then both of us could be satisfied." Is it a question of a search for unity? That is, is it really something that one wants in order to feel that one is completed by having expressed one's love for someone? If that is the case, do I really feel as if I miss something if I don't love? And should I have the three different forms of love, physical, emotional, or intellectual? And ^{is} if that, if I were really capable of the three different forms at the same time, would that approach a condition which is quite unearthly for me because it would appear so seldom and for that reason I would call it divine. You see, one has to look at it really from quite a different standpoint, because it is not that easily defined now. I say, I start out from a certain level, and I wish for someone, that I love that person and such a person to give it back to me as love. Does love really

question: is love sufficient unto itself? Does loving and giving in that sense produce in one a state which is ~~xxxxxx~~ satisfactory without having anything returned to one? And if it is a case of sharing, or if it's a case of hunting and searching for unity, is it then, because I missed such unity when I don't receive anything in return? Is that still love or not? What is the kind of love that I have for a plant or an animal when there is absolutely no possibility of a unity of any kind whatsoever? Surely physically not; emotionally perhaps, but what can a plant give me of an emotional kind, and only to be beautiful. And perhaps ^{as} so far as intellect is concerned the expression regarding dogs and animals of that kind like cats-- am I satisfied not to have anyone to speak to me, even if I express toward such an animal a real caring? What is it that I must consider when I want to think about love? That is, if I want to have it, can I produce it? On what is it dependent that I start to feel love for someone? Is it necessary to have someone around, or can I by myself love, as I am? Is it necessary ^{to share} a love for the world or a love for mankind-- with mankind? Or could I be by myself, sufficiently one with myself, in you might say, pouring forth love to be used by anyone who wishes, without desiring any particular connection or without even knowing where it goes and only just to be? Is it possible to be in a loving state? Is it possible to be in a state of static love without having any ^{dynamic} expression? Can love actually be as such? If that's the case, can I be an instrument of that kind of love? Is God loving man? Does ^{mean that} He want to share anything with us, or is it only that He in a certain benevolence looks down on us

and wishes for us to do the right thing or for us to live in conditions which are correct for us. You see, this question now-- what do I wish to share in and what do I want to produce? if I want to share something with someone do I need then from the other person that what he or she shares with me, a return in some form or other for my own completion? What is really when I care for someone, a person, or perhaps for any kind of a living creature? Is it necessary for me to live in such a way that I love Life? Is it necessary to love Life in order to help maintain it? Do I feel a responsibility for the maintenance of such Life and for that reason I should love it? What is the attitude that God should have and that is Divine Love towards me? Do I really think that He, in His so-called wisdom, could understand that what I am, could He bend down that far, to me, to be considered by Him as someone for whom He cares. You see, we don't know this, and we don't know very much about Love in general anyhow, because most of the time that what we call love is sex, and only that when sometimes that sex disappears that something else can come in its place, and perhaps it is more like a friendship, or perhaps it is an understanding, or perhaps it is a wish to create the conditions for someone so that the other person can live in reality for her or his own sake in such a way that they can grow? You see, this question, if I wish to share, what do I wish to share, with whom? And what? And can-- am I able to share? That is, is it possible for me really to give something in such a way that the other person can profit by it? Or do I sometimes wish to give because I want to get a thank you from the other person, so that they start to admire me because I love them so well?

It's a rather difficult question to know how it is because you will have to base it on your own experience, and your own experience may be quite limited. But if you go ~~within~~ in yourself, within yourself, that is, if you try to come to a conclusion, ^{and} you confront yourself with that what you consider in yourself loving states ^{then} and when you start to compare it with perhaps what you might have ^{liked} read or also what you might have thought about or what you may have considered as an ideal of a love existing, or that religiously you have this kind of a mystical wish for a union with God and love Him for that reason. Is there something in love that is based on dissatisfaction? Is it something of incompleteness that one wants to complete? Could it be, in many different ways, completed? That is, do I need such completion for it? The question of man and woman, the question of positive and negative, the question of superior and inferior, the question of a sharing and equalizing, so that ^{that} what I have can be joined and used by someone else and that I might profit by what someone else has and I don't have. These conditions, if you come to the conclusion of finding, ^{what is love} out, when I say I love someone, do I really love that person for his or her sake? I say, I love you. Why? What am I willing to do? That is, a statement, and can I let the statement go, and can I be believed because I say so, or is it necessary to show that I ^{love} love that person? And then, does that person expect that kind of a ^{showing} sharing from me? ^{Even} So ~~that~~ if I think that I can show it, do I show it in ^{the way} that kind of a way that that person could accept it? What is really required when I say "I love?" I love a plant--

that I try to understand the life of a plant, and that I wish to give it an opportunity for further growth, so that it will bear fruit or flowers, or whatever it may be that I will do, in order to till the soil or to give it enough food of a certain kind, and light, and sunshine, and to take off the light when it is necessary and do things ~~(towards)~~ the plant, sometimes maybe look at it, sometimes maybe hold it, sometimes cherish it, maybe sometimes if one is sentimental touch the leaves and ^{Q5} if the plant could purr. Maybe in that sense I understand a little bit about myself when I wish to do something for something that cannot as yet answer me and it can only respond and when I see ^{will} ~~that~~ response I am staisfied, and if I don't see the response then perhaps I am very much disappointed. How much of our love is dependent ~~upon~~ that kind of a response? The more ^{so} when I try to say I love an animal, and I love a person, do I wish that person then to return it, or could I, if I were capable, create a condition for the other person to grow into, even if such a person never knew that I created such conditions? You see, I'm putting it now very sharply, because ~~if~~ it's a question, if I really love, I am satisfied by having the state of ^{loving} ~~know-~~ ledge, and that then if I wish to express it that I hope that that expression will have an effect, and the satisfaction will be in seeing the effect, and not that my love is dependent on receiving again something in return. That what is, what I give, reflects on me by the state of my being, and that therefore true love has to come from a level of one's own being, in which, if it is possible, the three different levels of one's own three centers could be represented, so that in a love there

-13-

ought to be a physical and an emotional, and an intellectual side to it.
~~There~~ ^{Of it} is a question of sex-- it is fairly easy as far as physical union is concerned-- adjustments can be made, and sometimes one can find that there is a certain satisfaction in that sense. It may take some time. As far as intellect is concerned, it is excellent to have a chance to talk and to disagree and to keep on arguing and all the time, that even if one does not agree on the same things, one appreciates the thoughts of the other person and that love can exist even without having any agreement on an intellectual scale. As far as emotions are concerned, there is no particular reason why anyone who has not an emotion could not be satisfied, that is, there is no question about quarrelling about ~~an~~ emotions. ^{Emotionally one has to understand each other ~~is not~~ or not agree, + if there is no understanding there is no love on an emotional scale.} There is no fooling with emotions. Either one knows emotionally ^(there?) or one knows it is not right. And there is no argument, there is no adjustment, there is no possibility of explaining it, there is no chance of changing the emotion in a little way so that it would be more adaptable. Either it's there or it is not, and no further questions ^{asked.} ~~about it.~~

How do I now express it? That is, what do I wish? I say, I need it. For what? For fulfillment of myself psychologically? Is it necessary because of-- that my belief that sexual union would produce it? Of course it won't. All it will give me at a certain time that I am satisfied regarding my positivity and the other person's negativity, to make at that time a oneness of a certain kind, and that if, for ^{the} ~~that~~ reason let's say ^{of} ~~it's~~ procreation, that children might be born, it may be considered as a continuation of one's own life. But it is really a very small matter because many times our lives are not dependent upon that. They are dependent on an exchange of thoughts and ideas and

communication, and they are also based on ^athe relationship of an emotional kind that one feels like being together in the same place or in the same room, and that simply the fact that one exists together even without touching each other can give and produce already a feeling of oneness. If intellectually there is ~~constantly~~ ^{that one wishes to let the other person talk,} an exchange, that one wishes to try to understand what is the meaning of the other person, and that one oneself also has the possibility of explaining, that even if the conclusions are not reached at least one can reach a sense of unity. Perhaps the ideal way would be that on all three levels one could reach that kind of a-- let's call it understanding, that kind of really a communication. But what is involved? If I love a person, I become interested in the growth, the development, of that life of such a person, the same way ^{as} ~~that~~ I am interested in the life of a plant, and I want to create conditions for that, so I wish to do the same thing regarding the possibility of helping someone if I possibly can in such a way that that person really could respond to that what perhaps I could create in some way or other, but at least it would give an atmosphere conducive and helpful for the person who wants to grow. It presupposes I know how to create ^{it} ~~this~~; it also presupposes that I know how to do it and that I understand what is needed. So I have to enter into the psychological state of such a person, not only physically, but quite definitely a psychological something, that I must know what ^{it} ~~it~~ is that makes such a person really tick as it were, what is needed for that person to grow up and for me then to adapt myself sufficiently to be able to create that condition. If I push, that is, if I force it, it never works. If the condition is created so that the other person feels as if lifted up towards that, the difference


between pushing and that what is the creation of a vacuum, that is, that a person can grow without knowing where the wind, as it were, comes from, for that it feels that it wishes to be uplifted. If one could be by one's presence in such a way that the person becomes inspired to wish to take care of their lives and to become responsible for those, you might say, real virtues of one's self, to protect them and to wish to develop them, and then consider for themselves the wish for further wanting to live; maybe if such a condition in life could be created, it could be called love of a good kind, of a kind so that the other person says, "I know ~~that~~ so and so loves me, and I am, because of that, the better for it." This is really-- now we are talking about something that is a little bit more difficult, because it is-- although ideal, it is very difficult to attain. Still it is an aim, and it is an aim worthwhile to have in mind to find out if, and how far, one could really reach that kind of a state.

When all three centers of a man are engaged in this form of ~~wish~~, that is, that the wish to love a person is based on the understanding as reflected in his intellect, and in the attitude as far as his body is concerned, wishing not to be satisfied for selfish reasons, but for the possibility of that kind of unity, perhaps chemical attraction, that when all three centers are united, and mostly one's emotional center, going forward towards the other person, I reach then in myself a certain state of being which is unusual for me as a human creature, and then, if that is actually so, if that reaches that state of unity, then my love would be Divine. It is really there where it counts. It is a question when the totality of me as a being without having any further

arriere-^{pensee}francais or any other kind of a thought, but completely one in this one wish to help, to see what can be done, and in that sense to love someone, that then because of myself as a unit, that is, as an entity, and being engaged in that relationship, I reach the state in which I become myself, as ^{if} God, wanting to love someone else. You see, ~~has nothing to do then with the condition in which the person is + of what state they are;~~ it has to do with the possibility of the creation of conditions for them, for their growth, and in that sense, I, when I love, ~~has~~^{have} to be grown up enough to understand that what is needed on my part is the creation of conditions for them; with other words, that that what I am then even for one moment, I am then superior to them because I create conditions.

This is God. This is how God loves one. This is how He creates conditions, even on Earth. This is sometimes the necessity of understanding ^{that} ~~it~~ regardless of whatever the conditions of Earth are, that one could believe in the existence of Someone who is higher and above one, and towards whom it is possible to develop and evolve, and that for that reason that what is created for one, and that what could grow out, out of one, could then be considered with that kind of love towards the wish to grow, that for oneself, regardless of who else is around, and regardless of however it may be expressed regarding other persons, that there is also a form of love which has to do with the possibility of one's own growth and evolving; that I wish, with all the love in the world, for myself to grow in the direction in which I really could become a man. This, you might say, is like a reflection of God on Earth, wishing again to reflect back towards God. I do not care what particular terminology you want to use for yourself, but it is true that if you love

yourself like ~~that~~, if you love yourself as your neighbor, that is, if you love yourself for the sake of your wish to develop like you also would wish for someone else to develop so that in that sense you never could be selfish and never have to be altruistic, because it is even-even-- we are, in that sense, all alike, and if I wish to grow, I can ~~never~~ grow without hurting anyone. But, by being that what I am, perhaps someone else can be helped to be awake to the fact that they also have that same kind of an obligation, so that if I love myself in that sense, it means that I have the obligation for myself to develop this, and then, when I have the obligation and I take the responsibility I fulfill the love for myself. Whatever way one wants to look at the totality of all so-called loving kindness and things in the world, that is, that one begins by loving just one or two. Sometimes one says it's only possible to have a relationship with one. It may and it may not be. No one really knows this. Sometimes love could be overflowing. Maybe there is so much that it is necessary to have it go in different directions, and ^{it} maybe-it should not be limited entirely to one person. No one again knows this, and no one has any right to criticize about it. But when one lives, one loves also. The real dependence, that is, the question of how much love is, depends on how much life there is. ↘ And if the wish for one's life is there → in the sense of wanting to maintain it, there has to be also an equivalent of love towards others, so that they in turn can be maintained by that form of life, and that perhaps in that sense the expression of Life, when it is at the highest level, could be expressed in the form of love for someone. Earthly love as procreation, heavenly love as creation, so that the love

for mankind must take on the form of a structure, as the creation of those conditions for others, even knowing them or not knowing them, that one simply is and pours forth that whatever exists in order to be taken up by anyone who wishes and that one almost squanders one's love, without knowing exactly where it goes, but knowing that it has to go somewhere and as such ^{it} will never be lost, because it never can be in that way defined. You see, I'm now talking about the real Divine Love; that ^{is} if, that man has become for himself as God, and that in that sense he feels that whatever he now represents is the responsibility for the world as a whole, to the extent that he can reach it and to the extent that he can be in contact with it, and to the extent that he can communicate something from himself as perhaps the Holiest of the Holiest from himself, that what he wishes  he wishes them to share, to give, almost regardless of where it will go.

Of course, this, you might say, would be emotional stupidity, that a man can never be in that sense so overflowing that he should not know where things go. He must know. He must know how to direct it, where to ^{give} ~~direct~~ it, and how to take care of it, and not all forms of life are equal in their manifestations. So ⁱⁿ the beginning of that what is called love ^{for} of mankind always has to start with those who are nearest to one, and you might say, to try it out, to find out what one meets, and to what extent it is then ~~not~~ understood, and then if one wants to continue to live and to give with that, that one can extend one's love from one person to several. Not to dilute it, but constantly to be fed from that what is one's being. You understand ^{this} ~~this~~. It depends entirely on whatever the degree of one's own unity is. To the extent that one is completely

one, to that extent one can give everything of oneself. To the extent that one is a little bit one and the rest not as yet, to that extent I ^{will} ~~would~~ also spoil that what I give. If I remain on Earth, divided in myself, I will never be able to give any form of love, ^{then} and only temporarily something that looks like it. And that the only time that I ought to be satisfied as a human being in saying that I love, that must come from that state in which one's being is partly in a static form, not moving, and then the wish to move it, to become dynamic regarding the expression, and that then, in that level of being as a one entity, that then it can take on the form of any kind of an expression, whatever may be desired, that is, whatever may be required of one to manifest in a certain way. In that way, love takes on the form either of intellect, either of emotion, or of a physical. It is then that one must decide what is right for certain conditions, what can one do and what should one not do, and that in knowing this it has to come from something above, as it were, as if the level of being is above the component parts of the three centers, and that only from the standpoint of first unity for oneself, that then one would be allowed to love in any one of the three different directions. We forget this because we don't even know what it is to be one. We don't know what it is to be ~~able~~ to be like God. Even if we say I understand the principle of of ^{entity} ~~unity~~. I don't know how to experience it. And still, all forms of love that I would express have to start from the unity of myself regarding such a person, ^{regarding an animal} regarding a plant, that I, with all my heart and head and hands, wish that to exist, in such a way that that what exists can grow, and can grow in the direction in which it

should grow for its own; not my wish, but the wish of that what needs to be wished for, for that; and almost, you might say, eliminating myself, in its own wishes, and only to become a channel through which this kind of ~~the~~ form of energy could flow. It has to come from above; it has to come as if Divine, And then take on the form of the manifestations belonging to Earth; and it may be sex, and it may be intellect, and for some, and maybe it could be creation in the sense of wishing to make an emotional relationship.

Under that particular kind of a definition, one can now change the object, and it can be applied in any direction that one wishes Life to express, so that one can have love for one's work, one can have love for one's art, one can have love for one's science, one can have love for one's religion, one can have love for that maybe philosophy, which gives answers to all problems, and that perhaps ultimately it could become the love for Truth. If that's the case, if it is really a love for Truth, it would become Divine, if I know how to be truthfully objective. In that sense, what David Taylor said is right. Then there is something of that kind of divinity which is no longer subjective, but it can stand on its own ~~from~~^{on} the level of being of objectivity, since, on such a level, the three component parts have disappeared, and the subjectivity has disappeared, and in its place something exists which, if it wishes to express itself, for the time being, since one is still human, has to be expressed in the terminology of Earth.

So, maybe you can think about it; maybe you can try to find out what it is that you have. Maybe sometimes, in retrospect, you go over the different experiences that you have had and which you ^{have} called love, and that at the present time maybe you still consider that what you

consider love for yourself or for someone else, and you start then if you want to consider that, to compare it, what is it of an ideal state like we talked about, and that you yourself experienced, and to what extent do you think that you feel short and that perhaps you could change it. Or that that what you feel and you have considered love as yet may not be as good as you could make it, if you only wished to make it; and that perhaps certain things are necessary for oneself, not only to think about it but to do, and to start with very small things; but the things, even if they are small, should have the characteristic of something that is really different from that what we usually on Earth call a form of love in certain ways. If there could be that kind of a spark, that kind of divinity, that kind of real intention, that kind of reality, that kind of magnetic quality-- if that could be there in whatever one does or says or feels for oneself and expresses it-- if that could be there in one's posture, if that could be there when one looks, and when one really contemplates and wishes to convey, that one really cares, and that sometimes one can say it with words; sometimes one can not say it with too many words and sometimes you can not say it loudly; maybe sometimes you have to whisper; sometimes you're a little afraid that maybe it should not be even mentioned, because it is based on a feeling, and anytime I try to express a feeling, it looks as if I hurt it by expressing it. Perhaps the only way by which you can really love is by ^{being} living: that is, that when you take on a certain position, a certain look on your face, the expression, if you speak, your posture, that everything of you indicates that something in you is alive wishing to love someone-- I would almost say, who could resist it? If that is

an aim, it is worthwhile to consider it. To what extent and in how far ^{do} I represent, at times when it is needed, that kind of a form of love for someone else, and do I represent in myself that kind of love for myself in my wish to grow?

What other questions are there?

(pause)

It's rather a long subject, isn't it, ha? And it concerns us; it concerns every one of us. Sooner or later, all of us will have to face it. That is, we have to admit that we want to let it in, as it were. We have to admit that it could really complete one, that a person without love is really half a person or perhaps less, and that the difficulty very often is that we are afraid because we don't know how to handle it, and we are afraid that maybe it might take us up too much, and that sometimes one says it is much too much for me because I will die. Sometimes that it takes such a form of not being able to control it, so I become a little hysterical. And sometimes I don't want to show it enough because I think every once in a while that I ought to be a man and not to show my feelings. You see, all kinds of stupidities come up because of ordinary society having certain rules, and that the conditions under which one lives, which we call civilization, or so-called culture, every once in a while are dead against that what is really in myself as a natural and even a supernatural inclination. How to draw the line? What to be able to do? How to live and still satisfy such demands in oneself, such wishes within one, so that one could really express it at times when one wants to express it, and not be hampered by the so-called conditions which prevent one, usually,

from living in accordance with what one really feels within oneself that could dictate one's behavior, but that I consider many times ~~at~~ other people, and that in considering them I squash or I kill what is reality within me.

Where, I say, to draw the line, ^{at} that what can I express? And what is understood? And to what extent do I wish the understanding from someone? And to what extent do I have fear that someone will criticize me if all of a sudden I burst out gushingly and say "How beautiful!" That for that I may even be crucified because I don't seem to belong to the general public who keeps their mouth shut at the proper time.

Love, is one-- if one wants to-- if one wants to consider it, if one wants to live in accordance with it, ^{it is} ~~it is~~ a holy affair. It is something that first belongs to your conscience, and you have to work it out with your conscience without even telling anyone. It has to do with that what you really are, and what you at times can come close to when you are by yourself and you don't have to consider someone, but that for yourself you know what is within you and what at times you would like to express, and perhaps sometimes you can. Fortunate if you can, fortunate if at times you can really be what you are. ^{That you can be open; that you really can be -} Sometimes we say that you can let your hair down. That is, not afraid; that it is that you can be as you wish to be in the presence of someone because the other one understands. You could love such a person; you could love many people who could understand you. Also, it could be that you could become stronger and that you wish to express it because you wish it and never mind who will criticize you for that.

When it is a reality for you, you need not be ashamed. Because there are many ways by which certain things can be expressed and still one need not be-- have any particular fear that you will be put in prison or that you'll get into trouble with the police-- trouble with the policeman.

People base their friendships very often on something that is quite ephemeral. If life, that is, in friendship and acquaintanceship, could be based on a little bit more reality, which sometimes we have with one or two people, as if in that sense we perhaps could be a little bit more of a family and more open, and really try to say that "I have an aim and this kind of an aim I want to follow because it means a great deal to me;" when my love for others includes many people who I wish well and that I will continue to try to create for them the conditons which I believe are right for them, why should I be ashamed of it? But we limit ourselves so often ^{partly because we are a little afraid of giving too much and} partly because we ourselves don't have enough.

It is good to have an ideal. If you have it, you must work, for being able to put reality in that ideal. For that, you have to have a form of energy. For that perhaps you have to sacrifice a little bit of your own little bit of selfishness. Perhaps you have to understand yourself a little bit better ^{and} and you have to distinguish between that ^{+ that which is really for someone else, and you have to find out} what is really for you ~~and that what is~~ what are your motivations, what is it really that you yourself want, and to what extent are you selfish, to what extent do you really not love; because love of yourself at the expense of someone else is selfishness. There is a certain form of an appreciation of one's self the same way as you love yourself as your brother: that is, that you for yourself demand a certain condition

for your own growth; to that you're entitled. That's your condition in life; that's your condition as a man; and it's your responsibility ^{to} maintain ^{ing} yourself as a man. And then, outside of that, how much do you need? For a little bit of sympathy, for a little bit of luxury, for a little bit of something that you believe you're entitled ~~to~~, and ~~that~~ perhaps you can have without doing any harm to someone, also that ^{it} isn't so bad. But then, when it comes to actually living, and then to give, and then to try to enter into the lives of others, and ^{to} you try to understand, ^{then} then maybe you have to give up a little bit of your own selfishness, or your own smugness.

So...don't play with it. ^{It} ~~This~~ is serious. It is beautiful; but it is, nevertheless, something that one must consider. And when you consider your life, when you consider what you have done, how you have lived, what the experiences have been that you had, and to what extent that perhaps you may want to undo what you have experienced-- all that's based on the experience that you now know and the knowledge that you have of yourself-- you start, you start again, you put yourself on the basis of the past, it is the block from where I start again and again, and then to live tomorrow, the day after, next week, maybe longer, in accordance with certain precepts which you make for yourself, based on the concept of your love for others, love for the nearest, love for those you care for, love for those and for what? For whatever you think, where your love has to go.

You can give much more than you do, without causing any harm and without having any fear. Try it. Try to put it in your words when you talk to others. Try to make them feel that you care for what you say.

Don't just let it go-- said "Good morning", and no more. But say it--
^{otherwise}
~~all right~~, don't say it. Say it right. And tell. Don't wait until a
 person dies, that you say, ^I ~~you~~ loved him. Tell him now. Be honest. I
 would almost say, why not? It puts you ^{under} on a responsibility; yes. And
 they may take you up on it. But it will be worthwhile to cringe a
 little bit. Just go ahead. The world is not as yet filled with affection
 Maybe ^{we} ~~you~~ have to wait a long time. At the same time, one could start,
 and be, with common sense, loving in the real sense of the word, and
 with common sense knowing what you should be and can be, and then live, and
 dare. Don't have any fear; but if you want to take the word "love" on
 your lips, you must know what is meant and not just use it, because a
 lot of other people use it. ~~Be careful. Don't~~ Be careful. Don't
 use it unless you mean it. That word, at least. It might teach you to
 use words the way they ought to be used and not be too ^{to} ~~flattering~~ ^{flippant} or
 superficial, but when it comes to that particular word which could
 really mean one of the highest forms of your aliveness, that then you
 will not use it uselessly, but you will use it with intent, with emphasis
 and with content, that is, something ^{in it} that you put there, something of
 you, and really mean it, in such a way that the other person almost, you
 might say, gets startled, and says "What? What big ~~ideas~~ ^{ideals}!"

It ^{is} your week, it is your life, it is your possibility of ^{lifting of bringing} ~~bringing~~
 the level of your self up to a certain height, of really being and that
^{one of}
~~almost~~ the first requirement of that being is that it starts to love
 everything that is surrounded, that is, you are surrounded by, or that
 you see, and out of which you came; but it will include love ^{your} ~~your~~ self,
 love for husband, wife, children, love for your father and mother, ~~for~~

-27-

~~your family and mother~~, for your family and your ancestors, love

for those with whom you have dealings, love for many people that at the present time you even don't know but have a good feeling towards, and the totality of mankind; and then, love God, because He loves them.

Good night. Have a good week. Try to live. Try to live rightly. Try to do your best. Try to understand *it*. . Hope for understanding. Good night *to* all of you.

Transcriber: JoAnne Manze

Rough: Sandra Weidner

1st proof: *Andrea Asti*

2nd proof:

Final:

Oct 8 7